

REMARKS

Claims 39-42 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have added new dependent claims 43 and 44. Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification at least, for example, in previous versions of claims 2 and 22. Claims 3-5, 7-10 and 17-18 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis with amended claim 1 and new claim 43. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added. Claims 23-30, and 35-38 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis with amended claim 21 and new claim 44.

Summary of Substance of Interview

An interview with the Examiner was conducted on March 19, 2007. During the interview, the prior art reference Hiller *et al.* (U.S. 6,233,024) was discussed. Applicant proposed an amendment to claim 1 to recite the additional features of a display device having structure that is configured to modulate a two-dimensional warped image corresponding to electronically warped image data and project the warped image to create a projected image. Applicant further discussed how the proposed claim amendment is patentable over the Hiller reference. The Examiner agreed that the claim amendment would overcome the Hiller reference subject to RCE and further search and/or consideration.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 6-12, 16, 17, 21, 23, 26-30, 34, 35 and 39-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,024 to Hiller *et al.* ("Hiller") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,274,406 to Tejima *et al.* ("Tejima"). As noted above, claims 39-42 have been canceled. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 21 in accordance with the

agreements reached during the Interview conducted on March 19, 2007, and now traverse this rejection.

The combination of Hiller and Tejima does not disclose or suggest a two-dimensional structure of distortion correction as set forth in the claims. Hiller discloses the use of deflection devices in a laser-based display system that uses scan-line rendering of an image. On the other hand, the recitation of independent claims 1 and 21 is directed to a two-dimensional structure of distortion correction of the subject application. Therefore, as claimed by Applicants, the entire image is warped electronically on a display device and the correction is done prior to projection, unlike Hiller. Tejima does not cure these deficiencies.

The Examiner relies on Tejima to allegedly disclose a curved mirror to compensate for distortion (see Fig. 13c). Tejima, however, does not disclose or suggest a two-dimensional structure of distortion correction as set forth in the claims. Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made had been motivated to combine the references, the combination would still not result in the features claimed by Applicants.

Thus, claims 1 and 21 are patentable over the combination of Hiller and Tejima. Claims 3, 6-12, 16, 17, 23, 26-30, 34 and 35, which depend from one of claims 1 and 21, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence.

Claims 18-20 and 36-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hiller in view of Tejima and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0032982 to Nishizawa ("Nishizawa"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The combination of Hiller, Tejima and Nishizawa does not disclose or suggest the features claimed by Applicants. As noted above, the combination of Hiller and Tejima fails to

disclose or suggest at least a two-dimensional structure of a distortion correction as set forth in claims 1 and 21, and incorporated into claims 18-20 and 36-38 by virtue of their dependence. Nishizawa does not cure the above-noted deficiencies.

The Examiner relies on Nishizawa to allegedly disclose a luminance correction stage included in the image processing unit. Nishizawa, however, does not disclose or suggest at least a two-dimensional structure of a distortion correction and accordingly does not cure the deficiencies of the Hiller-Tejima combination. Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made had been motivated to combine the references, the combination would still not result in the features claimed by Applicants.

Claims 18-20 and 36-38 are therefore patentable over the combination of Hiller, Tejima and Nishizawa.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 43 and 44 which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 10/752,955

Atty Docket No. Q90773

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Francis G. Plati, Sr.', written over a horizontal line.

Francis G. Plati, Sr.
Registration No. 59,153

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 13, 2007